

March 23, 1982

LB 970, 970A

SENATOR WARNER: Yes. Someone indicated the credit report showed a lot of people in opposition and that happened to be to the amendment that we had printed in the Journal dealing primarily with the way of keeping local property taxes down by sharing the equity of the state employees salary with all public employees and that is no longer a part of the bill.

SENATOR KAHLE: Okay, I assume that is your closing, Senator Warner. So we are voting on LB 970. Those in favor vote aye, those opposed vote no. Record the vote.

CLERK: 31 ayes, 1 nay, Mr. President, on the motion to advance LB 970.

SENATOR KAHLE: The bill is advanced. Inadvertently 970A was left off of the agenda. Senator Lamb has asked that we go ahead and deal with LB 970A, if there are no objections? And, Senator Warner, seeing no objections, we will proceed with 970A. Do you have any comment?

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I move the A bill be advanced. As I indicated earlier we did go back and adjust the general budget bill appropriations in order to free up this amount of money, that the A bill should be utilized so that the appropriate amount per agency is distributed which the A bill does. So I would move its advancement.

SENATOR KAHLE: Senator Wesely, do you wish to speak on this issue?

SENATOR WESELY: Yes. I apologize but, Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I didn't have a chance to follow the discussion of Senator Warner. I think this is a very important issue and I would like to ask Senator Warner again to please explain what steps we are taking at this time with LB 970 as opposed to what the Governor proposed, and as I understand it, we are picking up some of the costs that the Governor would have had the state employees pay for, is that correct?

SENATOR WARNER: No. There was some misunderstanding originally that the Governor had proposed for the state employees to pick up all of the increased cost in health insurance which is not what he proposed. The state will pick up the cost, the increased cost for health insurance just as we currently are for the minimum...the low option which is what the state currently fully pays. Now if the employee wants broader coverage than the low option, why they would pay that as they always have. I think what